



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/614,315

07/08/2003

Shinichiro Hamada

239875US2SRD

8249

22850

7590

08/08/2006

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,315	HAMADA, SHINICHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H. Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/17/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 05/08/2006 with a priority date of **07/09/2002**.
2. Claims 28-53 are currently pending in this application. The Applicant canceled claims 1-27.
3. Claims 28, 40, and 53 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 28-34, 36-45 and 47-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, U.S. Patent No. 6,976,210 filed 08/29/2000, issued 12/13/2005) in view of Brown et al. (hereinafter Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,278,448 filed 02/17/1998, issued 08/21/2001), and in further view of Curbow et al. (hereinafter Curbow, U.S. Patent No. 5,669,005 filed 10/11/1995, issued 09/16/1997).

In regard to independent Claim 28 (and similarly independent Claims 40, and 53), Silva discloses *A document editing method* using a combination of a user's web browser together with a "personalization applet" (Abstract).

Silva also discloses *a step in which a document editing system actuates a first document processor for editing a plurality of structured documents each having a*

Art Unit: 2176

document structure including a plurality of elements, the first document processor corresponding to a first structured document selected from among said plurality of structured documents. The personalization applet is described in Figs. 2, and 6 and contains a number of components. Figs. 7A-B describe how the personalization applet and browser (creator/editor) combine to assist the user in generating a personalized web view (this is understood to be a portal-like or my page containing a plurality of content selected by the user from a plurality of different web sites or sources).

From Silva's Fig. 7A, a user activates (actuates) the personalization applet (step 701) and proceeds to identify and select content from a "first" web site to be included in a "first" clipping of the personalized web view (desired page or section of page) (step 702). It is noted that a web page (or portion, clipping) is understood to typically consist of structured content with elements as would be found in HTML documents commonly used and available on the Web to users of ordinary skill at the time of invention.

Silva also discloses several components within the personalization applet (see Fig. 2). These include a Web Clipping Manager (with extractor and parser parts) (202; 211, 210) (with which Silva discloses the limitation of a step in which the actuated first document processor reads the first structured document; see below description), a Web View Manager (201), and an Access Script Manager (203) (accesses either Smart Bookmark recorder/player (204), Site Description recorder/player (205), or the www directly via URLs (218)).

Silva fails to disclose the limitation of a step in which the first document processor determines type information associated with the read first structured

Art Unit: 2176

document. However, Brown distinguishes three types of desktop components and provides HTML for each (Col. 7, lines 21-47). In addition, Curbow also discloses a type determination (Col. 10, lines 32-54). Type, as disclosed by Brown, describes whether the component is static or active (in reference to the type of web content they are). In either case, Brown's components are interpreted as block documents since they (html documents) typically contain *tag information for specifying partial documents that correspond to operation units, the operation units including at least one of the elements that coincides with, or is included in, the first structured document* (block document interpreted as a markup document where content is "grouped" by either a single or pair of indicators or tags. Hence, an HTML document could be a block document as it typically contains content grouped by single, or a pair of tags (<TABLE>, , <DIV>).

Curbow discloses a type determination as to whether it is text, graphic, spreadsheet, etc., and its type, which is an indicator of the format for the part's contents. For example, one text part could be of the "Word Processor A" type, and another's type could be "Word Processor B", although both belong to the same category (text). Often, the last editor used on the parts contents will determine a part's type. Generally speaking, a category is a set of part types, and determines the set of part editors or viewers that are applicable to a given part. The properties of a part are stored along with its contents. For example, all of a part's properties can be contained in a "property sheet" that is stored with the part's contents (Col. 10, lines 32-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva, Brown, and Curbow as all three inventions relate to creating and

Art Unit: 2176

maintaining a composite document. Adding the teachings of Brown and Curbow provide the benefit of determining the type of a component to be added to the composite document.

Silva also fails to disclose the limitation of *a conversion step which is executed when the first structured document is not determined to be the block document, and in which the first structured document is converted into the block document, the first document processor (a) using a block conversion rule based on which the structured document is processed to obtain partial documents corresponding to the operation units and the tag information is inserted, or (b) inserting the tag information such that the first structured document becomes partial documents corresponding to the operation units.*

However, Curbow discloses automatically controlling whether material added to a document is incorporated as part of the document's intrinsic contents or embedded in the document as a distinct object. All parts are identified as belonging to a particular category of information, such as text, graphics, video, etc. Within each category, there may be different data formats or part types. When material from one part is to be added to another part, the respective categories of the two parts are compared. If they are the same, the added material is automatically incorporated into, and becomes a portion of, the intrinsic contents of the receiving part. If the two parts (donor and destination) belong to the same category but have different data formats, the format of the added material is converted into that of the destination part, and then incorporated into its contents (Col. 3, lines 33-48). Thus, Curbow provides for scenarios when the new content to be inserted is of similar or dissimilar type and converts the new content as

Art Unit: 2176

necessary to agree with the existing content. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva, Brown, and Curbow as all three inventions relate to building composite documents from disparate parts. Adding the teaching of Curbow provides the benefit of a method to incorporate new content even if that content is of a different type than what currently exists.

In regard to dependent Claim 29 (and similarly dependent Claims 41 and 52), Silva discloses clippings which are portions of web content chosen by the user from a given web page/site. The clippings have associated with them content (attributes) which aid in their identification, location (layout and addressing on the Internet), description (type of content (subject, is it an image or text, etc.) (Col. 5, line 22-Col. 7, lines 15).

Silva does not disclose the limitation of *at least one of a type and an insertion position of another partial document that can be inserted into the partial document, and the additional information is included in the parts data*. However, having such a position available to insert additional information (links) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention since Silva discloses that any of a number of parameters exist for each clipping and references used to retrieve and manage each clipping within the personalized page being constructed. The benefit would have been to provide for an easier consolidation of information.

In regard to dependent Claim 30 (and similarly dependent Claim 42), Silva fails to disclose *a parts moving step in which when a position on the document structure*

of the partial document selected as an operation target is moved, position information contained in parts data corresponding to the partial document is changed in association with a position of a move destination. However, Brown discloses adding, deleting, and modifying components of a composite desktop (Col. 6, lines 49-67; Col. 7, lines 1-8; Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva and Brown as both inventions relate to creating and maintaining customized web pages. Adding the teaching of Brown provides the benefit of editing techniques to keep the customized page current.

In regard to dependent Claim 31 (and similarly dependent Claim 43), Silva *fails to disclose the limitation where the editing step includes a parts insertion step in which when a first partial document included in the first structured document and selected as an operation target is inserted into a specified position of the second structured document, position information contained in first parts data corresponding to the parts data representing the first partial document is changed in association with an insertion position in the second structured document, and second parts data obtained as a result of a change is stored in the storage as parts data on the second structured document. However, Brown discloses adding, deleting, and modifying components of a composite desktop (Col. 6, lines 49-67; Col. 7, lines 1-8; Fig. 7).*

Silva does disclose some updating features that periodically update the clipping content (see Fig. 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva and Brown as both inventions relate

Art Unit: 2176

to creating and maintaining customized web pages. Adding the teaching of Brown provides the benefit of maintenance techniques to keep the customized page current.

In regard to dependent Claim 32 (and similarly dependent Claim 44), Claim 32 (and similarly Claim 44) contains content similar to that found in Claim 31 (and similarly Claim 43) and is similarly rejected.

In addition, Silva discloses that *new parts data is created, the new parts data including link information for associating a specified position in the second structured document with a parts document corresponding to the first partial document, and the created new data is stored in the storage as parts data on the second structured document* (Col. 12, lines 45-52).

In regard to dependent Claim 33 (and similarly dependent Claim 45),

Claim 33 (and similarly dependent Claim 45) contains content similar to that found in Claim 31 (and similarly Claim 43) and is similarly rejected.

In addition, Silva fails to disclose the limitations of (a) *when a first partial document included in the first structured document and selected as an operation target is inserted into a second parts document being the partial document included in the second structured document, (a) determination is made to determine whether or not the first partial document can be inserted into the second partial document based on a type of the first partial document contained in the first parts data and a type of another partial document that can be inserted into the second partial document contained in the second parts data, which is the parts data corresponding to the second partial document; (b) when the first partial document can be inserted into the second partial*

Art Unit: 2176

document, position information contained in the first parts data is changed in association with an insertion position in the second structured document, and third parts data obtained as a result of a change is stored in the storage as parts data on the second structured document; and (c) when the partial document cannot be inserted, a data format of the first partial document contained in the first parts data is converted into a data format that can be inserted into the second partial document, then position information contained in the first parts data is changed in association with an insertion position in the second structured document, and then new parts data obtained as a result of the change in the storage is stored in the storage as parts data of the second structured document.

However, Curbow discloses automatically controlling whether material added to a document is incorporated as part of the document's intrinsic contents or embedded in the document as a distinct object. All parts are identified as belonging to a particular category of information, such as text, graphics, video, etc. Within each category, there may be different data formats or part types. When material from one part is to be added to another part, the respective categories of the two parts are compared. If they are the same, the added material is automatically incorporated into, and becomes a portion of, the intrinsic contents of the receiving part. If the two parts (donor and destination) belong to the same category but have different data formats, the format of the added material is converted into that of the destination part, and then incorporated into its contents (Col. 3, lines 33-48). Thus, Curbow provides for scenarios when the new content to be inserted is of similar or dissimilar type and converts the new content as

Art Unit: 2176

necessary to agree with the existing content. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva and Curbow as both inventions relate to building composite documents from disparate parts. Adding the teaching of Curbow provides the benefit of a method to incorporate new content even if that content is of a different type than what currently exists.

In regard to dependent Claim 34, Claim 34 contains subject matter similar to that found in Claim 33 (and similarly claim 45) and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent Claim 36 (and similarly dependent Claim 47), Silva fails to disclose the limitation that *the editing step includes a parts deletion step in which: when the partial document selected as an operation target is deleted, parts data corresponding to the partial document selected as the operation target and parts data corresponding to the partial document contained in the partial document selected as the operation target are deleted from the storage*. However, Brown discloses adding, deleting, and modifying components of a composite desktop (Col. 6, lines 49-67; Col. 7, lines 1-8; Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva and Brown as both inventions relate to creating and maintaining customized web pages. Adding the teaching of Brown provides the benefit of maintenance techniques to keep the customized page current.

In regard to dependent Claim 37, (and similarly dependent Claim 48), Silva fails to disclose the limitation where *the editing step includes a parts editing step in which: when contents of the partial document selected as the operation target is edited, the partial document contained in parts data corresponding to the partial document is*

updated. However, Brown discloses adding, deleting, and modifying components of a composite desktop (Col. 6, lines 49-67; Col. 7, lines 1-8; Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva and Brown as both inventions relate to creating and maintaining customized web pages. Adding the teaching of Brown provides the benefit of maintenance techniques to keep the customized page current.

In regard to dependent Claim 38 (and similarly dependent Claim 49), Silva fails to disclose the limitation where *the editing step includes a parts adding step in which: when a new partial document is additionally inserted in the first structured document displayed on the display, the parts data including at least the new partial document and position information corresponding to an insertion position where the new partial document is inserted on the document structure is created and stored in the storage*. However, Brown discloses adding, deleting, and modifying components of a composite desktop (Col. 6, lines 49-67; Col. 7, lines 1-8; Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva and Brown as both inventions relate to creating and maintaining customized web pages. Adding the teaching of Brown provides the benefit of maintenance techniques to keep the customized page current.

In regard to dependent Claim 39 (and similarly dependent Claim 50), Silva discloses the limitation that *the editing step includes a parts creation step in which: a partial document in a range specified by a user is extracted from among the partial documents displayed on the display unit, new parts data corresponding to the*

extracted partial document is created, and the created new parts data is stored in the storage (Col. 12, lines 45-52).

In regard to dependent Claim 51, Silva discloses that *the block documents of said plurality of structured documents are distributed from a server apparatus* (Fig. 1 discloses web servers 108, and 110).

6. Claims 35 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Brown, and in further view of Curbow, and in further view of Kahan et al. (hereinafter Kahan, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0024536 filed 04/12/2001, Published 02/28/2002).

In regard to dependent Claim 35 (and similarly dependent Claim 46), Silva fails to disclose the limitation that *the parts data corresponding to the partial document includes at least one conversion rule, and the editing step includes a display switching step in which a display format of the partial document is switched by using one of the conversion rules.*

However, Kahan discloses rules associated with selected information in a personalized format as requested by the subscriber, and the personalized format is dynamically updated according to presentation rules and profiles set by the subscriber (Pg. 4, Paragraph [0051]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Silva and Kahan as both inventions relate to the aggregation of selected content. Adding the teaching of Kahan provides the

benefit of a partial document with attached rules allowing the content to be switched (converted) when added to the combined document.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 2176

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James H. Blackwell
08/05/2006

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER